A. interpretation: on the jan-feb topic, the negative cannot read a case that generates offense based on consistency with the minarchy or minimalist state if the aff reads a standard based upon government obligations and turn the aff.

B. Violation:

C. Standard: Qualitative Ground

There’s functionally zero turn ground for the AFF under his interpretation of the NC standard because offense derives from an increase in state jurisdiction. I can’t show the negative is inconsistent with a minimalist state – the state passing the wage *requirement* is a necessary consequence of any meaningful policy. Also proves even if there is turn ground, it’s bad since I cannot contest wage requirements force someone into doing something by the state and you say all state coercion is bad, and that aggregation is impossible. impacts: 1. It’s a necessary but insufficient - gives a 2-1 structural advantage because there are great turns to [my aff]. 2. skews aff strategy- forces me to overinvest on a layer I can’t win on and lets him pick the NC or the offense to the aff to go for in the 2NR based on which one I undercover. No loss of ground or strat under my interp – you get access to coercion as turns to a Kantian standard.